



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,991	02/23/2006	Atsushi Takahashi	10114961	3219
34283	7590	03/06/2009	EXAMINER	
QUINTERO LAW OFFICE, PC 2210 MAIN STREET, SUITE 200 SANTA MONICA, CA 90405			MAI, HAO D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	3732			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/06/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/524,991	Applicant(s) TAKAHASHI, ATSUSHI
	Examiner HAO D. MAI	Art Unit 3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 December 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/01/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-8, and 10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deady (2,265,804) in view of Politzer et al. (2,804,728).**

Regarding claims 1, Deady discloses a device comprising: a cup-shaped core (formed by nozzle 10 and pocket 16) having a cylindrical profile, an exterior wall, and a hollow interior region; a shaft 13 containing a connecting means 7 capable of connecting the device to the dental rotary instrument and capable of avoiding vibration around a rotation axis of the core during rotation; a hydrophilic sponge 12 covering the exterior wall of the core; and a latch plate (clamp 15) fixing the hydrophilic sponge to the core (Figs. 1-2). The sponge is inherently capable of being immersed in water prior to operation.

Note that the recitation "a prophy chip, mounted on a top..." has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Furthermore, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. In this case, merely calling/claiming a prophy chip in the preamble is more or less an intended use and does not convey structural limitations.

Deady discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the hydrophilic sponge being a grindstone sponge comprising a grindstone therein (claim 1). It is well known in the art of polishing and cleaning that grindstone and/or abrasive grains are embedded into a sponge to clean and polish surfaces. For example, Politzer et al. disclose a sponge 10 having abrasive material 14, e.g. powdered or ground pumice sand, emery, carborundum, etc., embedded therein (Fig. 1; column 2 lines 8-24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Deady by embedding a grindstone, i.e. abrasive material such as carborundum, into the hydrophilic sponge in order to provide the sponge an abrasive surface that effectively cleans and polishes surfaces. In the case of cleaning the skin, such finely grounded or powdered abrasive material would effectively cleanse and exfoliate the skin.

As to claims 3-8 and 10, Deady discloses the core comprising water and/or soap, which inherently is a foaming and/or coating agent, which is to be discharged through the pores 14 of

Art Unit: 3732

core 13 (Figs. 1-4; column 1 lines 60-64). The exterior portion 16 of the core is a nonwoven, hydrophilic, flexible, three-dimensionally, continuous, and porous film capable of conducting a solution (column 2 lines 34-48). Note that the core 13 is directly connected to shaft H.

4. Claim 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deady in view of Politzer et al., and further in view of Hirota et al. (JP 2002053469).

Deady/Politzer discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the grindstone being specifically a grindstone of

Hirota et al. disclose a composition containing $\text{Ca}_{10}(\text{PO}_4)_6(\text{OH})_2$ for rubbing onto the skin (see enclosed Derwent description). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Deady/Politzer by utilizing such particular grindstone of $\text{Ca}_{10}(\text{PO}_4)_6(\text{OH})_2$ embedded in the sponge in order to effectively clean and exfoliate the skin, while enhancing immunity as taught by Hirota et al.

5. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over St. Cyer (5,052,840) in view of Politzer et al. (2,804,728).

St. Cyer discloses a device (refer to Figs. 4-5) comprising: a cup-shaped core 110 having a cylindrical, cupped, or disk profile, an exterior wall and a hollow interior region; a shaft 14 (or best shown as 214 in Fig. 6-8) having a connecting means; a hydrophilic sponge 126 covering the exterior wall of the core 110; and a latch plate 120 fixing the hydrophilic sponge to the core. Note that the sponge is inherently capable of being immersed in water prior to operation.

St. Cyer however is silent to the hydrophilic sponge being a grindstone sponge comprising a grindstone therein (claim 1). It is well known in the art of polishing and cleaning that grindstone and/or abrasive grains are embedded into a sponge to clean and polish

Art Unit: 3732

surfaces. For example, Politzer et al. disclose a sponge 10 having abrasive material 14, e.g. powdered or ground pumice sand, emery, carborundum, etc., embedded therein (Fig. 1; column 2 lines 8-24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify St. Cyer by embedding a grindstone, i.e. abrasive material such as carborundum, into the hydrophilic sponge in order to provide the sponge an abrasive surface that effectively cleans and polishes surfaces.

As to claim 9, note that the sponge 126 is folded over an edge of the wall 108 into the hollow interior region of the core 110 and gripped by the latch plate 120 (Fig. 5).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's amendments/arguments filed 12/01/2008 have been fully considered but moot in view of new ground(s) of the rejection. Applicant's amendment to the claims, particularly the newly added limitation "an exterior wall" to the core, has overcome Wiseman. Thus, the rejection(s) under Wiseman has been withdrawn.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAO D. MAI whose telephone number is (571)270-3002. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 3732

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/Hao D Mai/
Examiner, Art Unit 3732**

**/Cris L. Rodriguez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3732**